

# B R O B D I N G N A G

-----  
 Brobdingnag #47

1966AV (Winter 01)

26 October 1966  
 -----

Game 1966 AV

Winter 1901

ALL GERMAN RESERVISTS CALLED TO COLOURS  
 KAISER ORDERS MAXIMUM EXPANSION OF ARMY  
 ALL OTHER POWERS LAUNCH FLEETS  
 GERMAN DEFI TO WORLD. BRITISH ULTIMATUM

The builds:

GERMANY (Shagrin): Army Munich. Army Kiel. Army Berlin.

RUSSIA (Zelazny): Fleet Sevastopol. Army St. Petersburg.

AUSTRIA (Munroe): Fleet Trieste. Army Vienna.

ENGLAND (Wells): Fleet London.

FRANCE (Birsan): Fleet Brest.

ITALY (Francis): Fleet Naples.

TURKEY (Lebling): Fleet Constantinople.

The players were advised of these builds by circular letter dated 23 October. The deadline for moves for Spring 1902 was set for Monday, 7 November 1966.

## PRESS RELEASES

Constantinople, 12 Nov.: Ali ben Yelisea, Minister of Communications, was brought to trial before the Ulemas for treason, amid one of the largest purges in the history of the Empire, and the first under Sultan Abdul Hamid II. Yelisea is accused of being the head of the large pro-Russian fifth column, one of whose members was Admiral Nejd, who defected to Russia after "losing" the Black Sea battle off the Crimea last Spring. Yelisea is believed to have been instrumental in the Summer break-down in communications which left the armed forces without orders and prevented co-ordination of moves with our allies. The Sultan assured the people that it would not happen again, and vowed to crush "all the Russians - domestic or foreign variety." Accordingly, he ordered the newly formed second fleet under Admiral Emeroc out to sea.

Taurida, 1 Jan. (RZ): In spite of the pesky shelling from the Turkish Fleet in the Euxine, work continues on the Tsar's Own without interruption. After a personal inspection of the Kuban II the Tsar is said to have enthusiastically predicted that Ankara will be the recipient of next winter's fireworks.

Paris, 5 Jan. (DPG): Premier Birsan today announced the successful negotiation of the French-German Alliance. Italy is warned that another move against members of this pact will be considered to be an act of war; which will result in appropriate action from the signatories.

Paris, 28 Jan. (APF): At the Quai d'Orsay today, the Foreign Minister gave a brief statement to the press. He said that France extends a welcome to Austrian friendship.

Berlin, 1 Feb. (DPG): It is rumoured that the young Kaiser, Wilhelm II, made a particularly violent outburst at last night's cabinet meeting. According to informed sources he said something like, "Nobody attacked me, damn it. Any volunteers for the chief enemy of the Reich, or so I have to stay at peace? Somebody provoke me, please! We're ready for you."

London, 2 Feb. (Reuter's): The British government has issued an ultimatum to Germany. In effect the ultimatum declares that if Germany does not immediately evacuate the Low Countries and destroy its fleet, England will go to war. The Government has a promise of co-operation from Italy if war is declared. W. Churchill, the First Lord of the Admiralty, declared: We do not wish to be engaged with the combined might of France and the German Empire, and we earnestly ask France for peace; but if we must fight we shall fight, and we are confident that all right thinking nations will come to our aid.

- - - - -

#### SEALED BAG

SEAN DONOHUE, 1020 Stoddert Ave., Waldorf, Md., 20601: I would like to comment on your rating system - I think mine is much better. Here it is.

1. I feel the ratings should be compiled by points. A winning player receives 7 points if all other players concede, 9 if he wins by the rules. In turn players in successive order according to the number of pieces at the time which they left the game would receive points as follows:

	<u>Default</u>	<u>Rules</u>
Winner	7	9
2nd man	5	7
3rd man	4	6
4th man	3	5
5th man	2	4
6th man	1	2
7th man	0	1

If there are ties, points are divided with fractions counted. A player thus divides his points if he wins with a partner.

2. These ratings should be compiled when a player receives a win, or when a game drops.

3. A mutual agreement. The last two countries who decide to call a game receive 6 points each; but only the 3rd power or last man to go out receives points. He, the 3rd power, would receive 3.

4. A player who must discontinue for a good excusable reason and who turns his country over to another player receives a point if his successor wins the game.

5. Variant games do not apply.

6. An agreement among all gamesmasters as to the starting date of the system and the time of termination should be reached or decided upon.

((+(Among those Diplomacy players who met each other by means of advertisements in The General there are, I understand, many postal games, played by letter, which are not completed but abandoned by mutual

consent. This is not the case in games so far played in the Diplomacy journals. The latter are nearly always played to a conclusion. The two exceptions which have so far appeared are more apparent than real: In one game two players had an even 17-17 split and decided to call it a draw rather than to fight it out; in another game a player built up to 16 units at which point the other players decided that he could not be stopped and conceded the game, saving one futile final year of play. It would seem to be somewhat invidious to give the victor in the latter game two less points than he would have got if play had continued for an additional move. As you say, your system, with two scales, would appear to be more suitable for the type of games arranged in The General than for those conducted in the Diplomacy journals.

Also, your system has an arbitrary element in it. The points given in your first list can be obtained from those given by the EROB rating system by multiplying the latter by one half and adding 3. That is, all except the winner's points can be obtained that way. For the winner you assign a bonus of one additional point. This promptly brings up the point of what the bonus should be. Should it be 1 of the other units, or 10 of them? One of the main ideas behind the EROB rating system was to try to avoid all such arbitrary elements. jamcc+))

CONRAD F. von LETZKE, 5327 Hilltop Drive, SAN DIEGO, Calif., 92114:

Personally, the Coastal Crawl is taboo in Costaguana (which, by the way, still exists after a fashion - for slow games).

((+(The roll now stands: For Coastal Crawl: Calhamer, Boardman, Welker, and myself. Against Coastal Crawl: Wells and you. The rest is silence. I must say, Conrad, that I don't think that this is an issue that I could get very excited about, one way or the other. As you know, the topic was first brought up in EROB, but I had no opinion on it, one way or the other, at the time. Had Calhamer declared the other way, I would have followed him just as cheerfully as I do now in adhering to the Crawl. jamcc+))

CHARLES F. REINSEL, 120 8th Ave., Clarion, Penna., 16214: Re "Cutting

one's own throat". ((+(This refers to an item in the last issue of EROB, under that title.))

No! This idea is not in the spirit of the game.

Big Brother is against it.

- - - - -

TELEPHONE NUMBERS: Players were asked, last issue, to send me their phone numbers for my files. About half who have written since then have done so, and about a half of those, have indicated that the number may be published. There should be a delay until the next issue in case others also wish this done, and then the phone numbers of those who want the information published will be listed.

PLAYERS' RUNNING MAINSIS: quite a few players in both games have taken up the idea suggested by Monte Zclazny and have sent in comments for publication at the end of the game.

- - - - -

ERODINGWAG is published by J. A. McCallum, Ralston, Alberta, Canada.